

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully considered the rejections made in the Office Action mailed April 1, 2008 (the "Office Action"). Claim 11 has been amended. Claims 1-4 and 11-23 are pending in this application, and claims 1-4 have been previously withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments made, the remarks that follow, and the Request for Continued Examination submitted herewith, the application is in condition for allowance. Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner for a Notice of Allowance.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claims 11-18 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Glover (U.S. Patent No. 4,744,741). Unlike the claimed invention, Glover discloses a molding apparatus in which a plastic sleeve and a sealing ring are injection molded separately and then subsequently molded together. In Glover, a sealing ring core 19, which is on a first side of a core block 17, mates with a sealing ring mould profile 18 to define a mould 33 having a molding cavity 30. However, a sleeve core 20, which is on a second side the core block 17, mates with a sleeve mould 15 to define a mould 32 having a mould cavity 29.

The first side of the core block 19 does not and cannot align with the sleeve mould 15 to define cavities that can be filled with a substance. Rather, after the mould cavities 29 and 30 are filled, a sealing ring 3 remains on the first side of the core block 19. The core block 17 rotates 180 degrees such that the sealing ring 3 on the first side of the core block 19 is pressed together with a plastic sleeve 1 that is molded onto the sleeve mould 15. As such, the first side of the core block 19 does not and cannot align with both the first platen 11 to define a first cavity and with the second platen 13 to define a second cavity.

Conversely, the claimed invention requires, in part, that “the front part and the first sides of the middle parts are alignable together to form a plurality of first perimeters defining a corresponding plurality of first cavities substantially bounded by the front profile and the first sides of the middle profiles.” Furthermore, the claimed invention requires, in part, that “the back part and the first sides of the middle parts are alignable together when the plurality of sub-unit molded products are still attached to the first sides of the middle parts to form a plurality of second perimeters defining a corresponding plurality of second cavities.” In the claimed invention, the first sides of the middle parts aid in defining cavities with both the front part and the back part.

The Office Action is correct that *Ex parte Masham*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987) stands for the proposition that “recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus” if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. However, another tenet of patent law that the Office Action failed to consider is that “[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. Am. Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added).

As explained above, the first side of the core block 19 in Glover is not arranged in the same way as the first side of the middle part as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Glover is quite different and unlike the claimed invention. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claims 11-18 and 20-23 are not anticipated by Glover and respectfully requests allowance of these claims.

With respect to claim 19, applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glover in view of Watanabe (U.S. Patent No. 5,196,213). As explained above, Glover does not anticipate claims 11 or 18, from which claim 19 depends. Furthermore, Watanabe does not make up for the deficiencies of Glover discussed above. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is not made obvious over Glover in view of Watanabe. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests allowance of this claim.


For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the application. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone call would expedite the prosecution hereof, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, such as a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 1, 2008

By



Edward J. Chalfie; Reg. No. 29,370
Ardy L. Hammer; Reg. No. 61,048
HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS
WELSH & KATZ
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312) 655-1500
Fax: (312) 655-1501